ATTENDING: Ellen Caskey, Dana Emmerton, Andy Elkins, Chris Reis and Susan

McCallum, Deputy Clerk

ABSENT: Pete Raskovic and Chris Narveson.

ALSO ATTENDING: Keith Seward

CALL TO ORDER: E. Caskey called the meeting to order at 9:05 am.

1. <u>Proof of Posting:</u> S. McCallum, Deputy Clerk confirmed proper posting.

- 2. <u>Approve Minutes of September 13, 2012:</u> Minutes reviewed, A. Elkins moved to approve the minutes with correction of A. Elkin's last name in #4.C. Reis 2nd. Motion carried.
- 3. Public Comments: None
- 4. <u>Informational, Hoesly Pond Timeline</u>: E. Caskey reported this was talked about at joint meeting; a slow pace, they want a dog friendly environment, no fence yet this coming spring and there was a timeline emailed to some members of this committee. This topic will be added to next agenda because the communication from the FFA via Village of New Glarus was not available.
- 5. Discuss and consider sinking funds: E. Caskey asked K. Seward to update the committee. He stated it is in flux as options are being considered. He had a question in minutes, #4 in regards to Salter explanation and conflict statement by D. Emmerton, A. Elkins stated that Salter explained the role of the Library board. K. Seward expounded on the Library Board's role and regarding Village of New Glarus funding of the board. D. Emmerton stated she was aware of conflicts regarding location of library. The commission questioned how the Town and Village worked together on the library project, including amount of donation from the Town to the project and how this fund would be utilized and whether the motion from the commission to donate needed to specify amount, term and purpose of donation. K. Seward felt that there is probably confusion due to this committee not being directly involved in negotiations, so he handed out a sheet on agreement options regarding Library. E. Caskey said when the commission was asked to make a recommendation for the sinking funds we did not understand that it was advisory only. K. Seward explained the relationship/organization structure of negotiating committee. He stated the bulk of the negotiations are between the Town and Library Board, with Village monitoring impact to them. Any final decisions/agreement recommendations would go forward with Village approval but be between Town and Library Board. The amount of space has been defined as about 700 sq. ft. for Town offices, 3 potential office spaces, one enclosed and two open. In the Library's plan is a community room, we would negotiate this use as needed regularly for meetings. Public spaces would be restrooms and utilities. A market study was done on going rates in village for rental, currently we pay about \$10,000/yr. The handout has 3 potential options currently being discussed for a 20 year agreement, included in discussion is any amounts the Town could contribute. We are already committed to impact fees, about \$10,000 to be

paid to Library upon completion that must go toward capital. In addition in the Town coop agreement (CBA, non-finalized) with Village, there is revenue sharing from the Town to the Village. This is based upon usage calculation for current library less the amount of taxes from County taxing of Town residents. In 2011this County taxation was roughly \$52,000 with about \$38,000 to New Glarus Library, the remainder goes to other libraries used by residents. The Library Board liaison to the Town asked what other funds would be available from the town. The Town Board's position is that if they commit the sinking fund, they should have recognition for these funds, such as reduced rent. The Town's approved sinking fund plan stated if these funds were not used in 5 years, they would revert to general municipal funds. K. Seward stated this is technically a Town Board decision but he and board feel this decision still needs to go to the electorate. E. Caskey questioned how the Remax location may affect ongoing plans. K. Seward said there is a group exploring this option. The handout has the following: Option #3 Fair Rent based on comparables, Option #2 Fair Rent reduced by contributions and Option #1 Up front payment, which the Library Board prefers as a source of revenue for a campus style of development. The final decision will be based upon architect design and costs associated. In Concept #1 Library allocates space but you pay for this up front, then what happens with space at end of 20 years if they agree to part because we don't own it but it is worth something, there would be incremental calculations to determine what that is worth to the Town. Option #2, Fair rent calculation minus our contribution, and that is what our rent would be. D. Emmerton suggested, what if a condominium option, Seward said this option has not come before town board yet that has it's has own criteria, he sees this as a possibility. Seward how does this all relate to the Parks Commission, this all hinges on negotiations, at a point where it is presented to electorate with proposals that are too much in flux right now, so if this body takes a position now and not in negotiations, E. Caskey stated she feels the group is being left out. K. Seward would like the parks commission to review and recommend approval of final negotiations. This final negotiation is potentially taken to annual or special Town meetings where parts of annual budget are approved. The Parks Plan was recommended to the Town Board whom reviewed and approved. Seward wanted this group to know what is going on and have input. The amount available as of September 2012; \$41,547.59 Park/Town Hall fund and \$23,912.47 Community Partners fund. K. Seward stated he has remained neutral on other conflicts of location, that he approves of a new Library no matter where it is located. Library Board needs to communicate the operating costs once a design is finalized. D. Emmerton asked is the question to show them where we stand or wait for design and then communicate our recommendations. K. Seward stated this commission can decide what they would like to see and the ultimate decision is the Town Board's. He also said you can do it as a group or as an individual at town board meeting on October 30th. He said the decision will probably not be made at that meeting because all input may not be ready and there may need to be another meeting. E. Caskey asked what we need to do, K. Seward asked for the commission's support at the meeting of the 30th or future special meetings. E.Caskey talked about parks plan with 5 year plan limits but she felt it is out of our hands, which was unknown six weeks ago. We also spent time talking about this

issue in the past, without the pertinent information, and we made a decision at the last meeting. K. Seward said the information wasn't available before this time and the board wants to bring this to the general electorate. He asked for suggestions on how to communicate this complicated issue to the electorate. D. Emmerton suggested giving them a choice between two such as; keeping the monies with the Parks Commission for future use or put it towards the library. A. Elkins suggested a discussion about the sinking fund. He also felt too much information is not good, the options should be simplified, and then which funds would be used and what is the impact on where those funds are coming from and their intended purpose. D. Emmerton suggested including what we would do with these funds if left with commission. E. Caskey asked, and would we continue to put monies in those sinking funds? K. Seward conjectured as to whether we would divert monies from both of the funds or the possibility of grants for a 4th option of a condominium concept. A. Elkins questioned whether the monies after 5 years go back to the general funds? K. Seward stated the parks commission has a budget forwarded to the town board budget discussions, currently the board has approved this continued \$6,000 sinking fund, looks like revenue cap still allows this. D. Emmerton felt meeting once/twice a month usage of community room for the amount this group is funding is too much. K. Seward stated this room would see use from all committees etc. A. Elkins stated he sees that there isn't any other funding pot and the board is using the Park Commission sinking fund money. K. Seward stated this commission's role would decide how and where funds for the parks part of the project. D. Emmerton stated this is what was decided at our last meeting, to use the smaller fund appropriately for park area. She also felt that with option # 3 the larger sinking fund amount would go towards reducing rent costs for town office. And since the \$42,000 is not in Park Commission control the choices could be based upon larger decisions of the electorate. A. Elkins felt that it is difficult to make a recommendation without the decisions on options finalized. K. Seward stated that these options decisions are just coming through and the Library Board is thinking of scaling back the size due to funding constraints. There are multiple townships involved with the fundraising activities. D. Emmerton questioned whether in future budgets we would build this fund back slowly after being given to board decisions. K. Seward stated this is all part of board responsibilities regarding taxing. E. Caskey stated they worked on the Parks Commission budget, is it pertinent? K. Seward said it has been considered by the board, if approved another \$6,000 into fund in 2013. E. Caskey suggested that a budget discussion be added to next meeting once board decisions are made.

6. Website Renewal Discussion: E. Caskey meet with web host and determined there was a billing error on her end (one time \$30 annual fee for analytics, does not need to be done again, can be revisited) we still owe \$300 by end of year which does not include domain name cost which is already paid. K. Seward asked whether web hosting and maintenance is about \$600 per year. E. Caskey stated that web hosting is \$278 for two years and \$300 is her annual fee for two years, so this is total through 2014. She also stated that there isn't a fee for the web name.

- 7. Discuss and consider purchase of trees and educational workshop: A Elkins did not discuss workshop but got information on tree prices from outside Green County for evergreens. His recommendation is to go with transplant size because of price as opposed to #1 or #2 pots plus ease of transporting and keeping until pick-up. We could purchase small plastic bags so when it comes out of a bucket for taking home. The cost between .80 and \$1 each for evergreens covers most of the varieties. He said we need to decide how many total varieties and whether deciduous as well. E. Caskey asked about theme of workshop is it natural fence lines or wind break and then that is what we should go with. A. Elkins said yes to both but he suggests we could include some deciduous because people would want to include those. K. Seward suggested that these not be planted in right of way, when this happens in the area we mow they get mowed off. E. Caskey said this could be introduced at workshop, including the right of way criteria. A. Elkins said we could also include Diggers hotline information for underground issues. E. Caskey said could we order some through Green County or other outlet? A. Elkins stated that the price is better from Green County with supplementing from another outlet. We need to decide how many varieties and how many of each. Green County has \$2 a tree for 2-3ft and 3-4ft deciduous trees, must order 10 each. E. Caskey suggested 2 deciduous types and 3 evergreen types. D. Emmerton said she'd like Sugar Maples and/or something for a variety like Sycamore as you see a lot of black walnut and oak in the area, also to consider whether the variety has a lot of whirly gigs. A. Elkins stated we will need to make a recommendation at next meeting as orders will be due in November/December. C. Reis wanted to know the evergreen varieties. A. Elkins stated Green County is specific about Red Cedar/Juniper trees which are native to this area. But they are considering more options and he will know more at the next meeting. E. Caskey said they will also schedule the workshop date at the next meeting. A. Elkins said trees will come in the second week of April. E. Caskey said we would need to call Paul about when would he be available. A. Elkins suggested weekend after trees arrive. Suggested dates are Saturday April 6 and 13. Also to consider is school spring break. They will set workshop date after determination of delivery date. A. Elkins presented brochure from website of Schumacher's Nursery, in Minnesota, members can check out website prior to the next meeting to view pictures of trees. Prices are in the brochure A. Elkins has.
- 6. Schedule next meeting and agenda: Thursday, November 15, 7pm at town hall. Discuss sinking funds, Hoesly pond timeline and tree workshop. We will wait until spring for postponed Blue Ridge visit. Russ Whitacre is meeting with burn group to evaluate fall burn; he will let us know the outcome. We will determine seeding timeline, whether in fall, there is prairie grass left from previous purchase. E. Caskey will follow-up for group and possibility of a quick seeding project. Russ is planning to sow after the burn as seeds are applied with burn residue and remains dormant until spring.
- 7. <u>Adjourn</u>: A. Elkins moved to adjourn. 2nd by E. Caskey. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 10:41 am.